



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

X  
Q

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/664,605	09/15/2003	Myriam Golembo	81408-4300	3940
28765	7590	12/22/2005	EXAMINER	
WINSTON & STRAWN LLP 1700 K STREET, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20006			BORGEEST, CHRISTINA M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1649	

DATE MAILED: 12/22/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/664,605	GOLEMBO ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Christina Borgeest	1649	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 March 2004.

2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-66 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) 1-66 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Election/Restrictions***

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims I-30, 45-49 are drawn to methods of increasing the size of a bone growth plate comprising administration of natriuretic peptides, classified in class 514, subclass 2.
- II. Claims 31-44 are drawn to pharmaceutical compositions comprising natriuretic peptides, classified in class 530, subclass 350.
- III. Claims 60-62 are drawn to compositions comprising natriuretic peptide secreting cells, classified in class 435, subclass 325.
- IV. Claims 63-66 are drawn to methods of treating skeletal dysplasias comprising transplanting/implanting natriuretic peptide secreting cells to a patient, classified in class 514, subclass 2.

Inventions I and II are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case natriuretic peptides can be used to treat other conditions, for instance congestive heart failure, or in diagnostic assays measuring damage in heart disease. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given

above and the search required for Group I is not required for Group II, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Inventions I and III and I and IV are not related. Invention I is drawn to methods of increasing the size of a bone growth plate comprising administration of natriuretic peptides and Invention III is drawn to compositions comprising natriuretic peptide secreting cells. The inventions as claimed do not overlap in scope, i.e., are mutually exclusive and are either not capable of use together or can have materially different design, mode of operation, function, or effect. See MPEP § 806.05 (j). In the instant case, invention I does not make use natriuretic peptide secreting cells. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group I is not required for Group III, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Invention IV, which is drawn to methods of treating skeletal dysplasias comprising transplanting/implanting natriuretic peptide secreting cells to a patient has a different scope than treatment with a pharmaceutical composition (Invention I). Restriction is deemed to be proper because these methods appear to constitute patentably distinct inventions because they are directed to methods that are distinct both physically and functionally, and are not required one for the other. Invention I requires administration of a protein, which is not required by any of the other groups. Invention IV requires implantation of cells, which is not required by any of the other groups. Therefore, a search and examination both methods in one patent application would result in an undue burden, since the searches are not co-extensive.

Inventions II and III are different products. Although there are no provisions under the section for "Relationship of Inventions" in M.P.E.P. § 806.05 for inventive groups that are directed to different products, restriction is deemed to be proper because these products constitute patentably distinct inventions for the following reasons. Groups II and III are directed to products that are distinct both physically and functionally, are not required one for the other, and are therefore patentably distinct. Furthermore, the protein of Group II can be made recombinantly, by chemical synthesis or by isolation and purification from natural sources, and the natriuretic peptide secreting cells are more complex in their nature cannot be chemically synthesized. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group II is not required for Group III, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Inventions II and IV are also unrelated. Invention II is drawn to pharmaceutical compositions, whereas invention IV is drawn to treatment of skeletal dysplasias comprising transplantation or implantation of cells. The method of Group IV does not make use of the pharmaceutical composition of Group I. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group II is not required for Group IV, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Finally, inventions III and IV are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process

(MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the natriuretic peptide secreting cells can be used as a source of natriuretic peptides used in diagnostic assays measuring damage in heart disease. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and the search required for Group III is not required for Group IV, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. **Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product** will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier. Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)*," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder.** Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: NATRIURETIC PEPTIDES. These are different peptides with different amino acid sequences and different structures. Success with one does not guarantee success with another.

I. NATRIURETIC PEPTIDES

I-a. SEQ ID NO: 1

I-b. SEQ ID NO: 2

I-c. SEQ ID NO: 3

I-d. SEQ ID NO: 4

I-e. SEQ ID NO: 5

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claim 1 is an example of a generic claim.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the

Art Unit: 1649

case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christina Borgeest whose telephone number is 571-272-4482. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Janet Andres can be reached on 571-272-0867. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Christina Borgeest, Ph.D.

*Elizabeth C. Kemmerer*

ELIZABETH KEMMERER  
PRIMARY EXAMINER